

PATENT

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****NOV 17 2005**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): David M. Ungar

Title: MODULAR PARSER ARCHITECTURE

Application No.: 10/058,647

Filed: January 28, 2002

Examiner: Ingberg, Todd D.

Group Art Unit: 2193

Atty. Docket No.: 004-4556

Confirmation No.: 3845

November 17, 2005

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Applicant requests review of the final rejection mailed on June 17, 2005 in accordance with the Official Gazette Notice (1296 OG 67) of 12 July 2005 in light of the following Remarks.

PATENT

REMARKS

The Examiner rejects claims 1 – 26 under §102(b) “or, in the alternative” under §103(a). Applicant requests review of the final rejection because the rejection by the Examiner clearly fails to satisfy the legal requirements of both 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). This is readily apparent in the Examiner’s acknowledgement that limitations of the claims are not taught or suggested in the combination of Peake and Aho. **In response to Applicant’s statement that certain limitations of the independent claims are not taught or suggested by the art of record, the Examiner states that “this is a good thing” in the Final Rejection of June 17, 2005 (Final Rejection, page 9, third paragraph).** To aid the Examiner, Applicant identified example advantages of the claim limitations, which are not taught or suggested by the art of record, in the Response After Final Rejection of August 17, 2005 at page 7, first full paragraph. The Examiner has clearly failed to identify any art of record that teaches or suggests miniparsers, each of which are limited to a particular subset of syntactic constructs to be parsed, and successive transformations, each of which transform a syntax tree resulting from a predecessor transformation, as variously recited in independent claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 26.

Peake addresses parsing of embedded languages with modular parsers and the Examiner refers to Aho for disclosure of fundamental parse theory, inherent in Peake. Since programs began to include code from multiple languages, for example C and SQL, Peake proposed modular parsers. One parser would parse C code while another parser parsed SQL code. Applicant’s claims specifically recite limitations that limit each of the plurality of miniparsers to a subset of syntactic constructs. For example, a miniparser is limited to parsing just comments or just top-level statements, and does not parse syntax for an entire language or grammar. Applicant has distinguished Peake’s modular parsers from miniparsers as recited in Applicant’s claims in the Response After Final Rejection on page 7, first partial paragraph and the Response to Non-Final Office Action of December 23, 2004 at page 7, last paragraph.

The independent claims also recite limitations of successive operation on respective syntax trees and successive transformations of predecessor trees. The Examiner refers to combinatory parsing in Peake, which discloses concatenating parse streams. Applicant distinguished the art of record from these limitations in the Response to Non-Final Office Action at page 8, first full paragraph and in the Response After Final Rejection at page 8, line 1 – page 9, line 9.


request for pre-appeal brief conference

- 2 -

Application No. 10/058,647

PATENT

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the claims are disclosed or suggested by Peake and Aho, standing alone or in combination. The Examiner has not identified any disclosure or suggestion of the limitation of the claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the existing claims be allowed and prosecution remain closed, since none of the art of record discloses or suggests the claims.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
 Steven R. Gilliam	17-Nov-2005 Date
EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: <u>N/A</u>	

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6320 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)